arXiv:1409.6777v2 [quant-ph] 26 Feb 2015

Impossibility of Classically Simulating One-Clean-Qubit Computation

Keisuke Fujii* Hirotada Kobayashi† Tomoyuki Morimae‡ Harumichi Nishimura§
Shuhei Tamate†¶ Seiichiro Tani‖

*The Hakubi Center for Advanced Research and Graduate School of Informatics
Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan

†Principles of Informatics Research Division, National Institute of Informatics, Tokyo, Japan

‡ASRLD Unit, Gunma University, Kiryu, Gunma, Japan

§Department of Computer Science and Mathematical Informatics
Graduate School of Information Science, Nagoya University, Nagoya, Aichi, Japan

¶RIKEN Center for Emergent Matter Science, Wako, Saitama, Japan

‖NTT Communication Science Laboratories, NTT Corporation, Atsugi, Kanagawa, Japan

25 February 2015

Abstract

Deterministic quantum computation with one quantum bit (DQC1) is a restricted model of quantum computing where the input state is the completely mixed state except for a single clean qubit, and only a single output qubit is measured at the end of the computing. It is proved that the restriction of quantum computation to the DQC1 model does not change the complexity classes NQP and SBQP. As a main consequence, it follows that the DQC1 model cannot be efficiently simulated by classical computers unless the polynomial-time hierarchy collapses to the second level (more precisely, to AM), which answers the long-standing open problem posed by Knill and Laflamme under the very plausible complexity assumption. The argument developed in this paper also weakens the complexity assumption necessary for the existing impossibility results on classical simulation of various sub-universal quantum computing models, such as the IQP model and the Boson sampling.

1 Introduction

Background. The *deterministic quantum computation with one quantum bit (DQC1)*, often mentioned as the *one-clean-qubit model*, is a restricted model of quantum computing proposed by Knill and Laflamme [17] originally motivated by nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) quantum information processing. A DQC1 computation over n qubits starts with the initial state of the completely mixed state except for a single clean qubit, namely, $|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \left(\frac{I}{2}\right)^{\otimes(n-1)}$. After applying a polynomial-size quantum circuit to this state, only a single output qubit is measured in the computational basis at the end of the computing in order to read out the computation result.

The DQC1 model does not seem to be universal for quantum computation. Indeed, it was shown to be non-universal under some reasonable assumptions [4]. Moreover, since any quantum computation on $\left(\frac{I}{2}\right)^{\otimes n}$ is trivial to simulate classically, the DQC1 model looks easy to classically simulate at first glance. Surprisingly, however, the DQC1 model turned out to be able to efficiently solve several problems for which no efficient classical algorithms are known, such as calculations of an integrability tester [22], the spectral density [17], the fidelity decay [21], Jones

and HOMFLY polynomials [23, 15], and an invariant of 3-manifolds [14]. While the amount of entanglement is very limited, the DQC1 model does exhibit some non-classical correlations [9, 10, 11]. In short, the DQC1 model is believed to be a very restricted, but still genuinely quantum, computing model — a *sub-universal* quantum computing model whose power is something between classical computation and universal quantum computation. It is a long-standing open problem whether efficient classical simulation is possible for the DQC1 model, posed already in the first paper of the DQC1 model by Knill and Laflamme [17].

With the development of quantum algorithms, proving hardness of classical simulations of quantum computations, even in restricted quantum computing models, becomes a very fundamental methodology for clarifying the power of quantum computing. Recently, a number of studies focused on the hardness of *weak* simulation of sub-universal quantum computing models under some reasonable assumptions [27, 7, 2, 20, 8, 16, 19, 25, 24]. Namely, a plausible assumption in complexity theory leads to the impossibility of efficient sampling by a classical computer according to an output probability distribution generatable with a quantum computing model. Among them are the IQP model [7] and the Boson sampling [2], both of which are proved hard for classical computers to weakly simulate, unless the polynomial-time hierarchy collapses to the third level.

An interesting question to ask is whether a similar result holds even for the DQC1 model. Very recently, Morimae, Fujii and Fitzsimons [19] approached to answering the question. They focused on the $\mathrm{DQC1}_m$ model, the generalization of the DQC1 model that allows m output qubits to be measured at the end of the computation, and showed that the $\mathrm{DQC1}_m$ model with $m \geq 3$ cannot be weakly simulated unless the polynomial-time hierarchy collapses to the third level. Their proof is based on a postselection argument that fictitiously projects a state onto a specific branch of the superposition with unit probability. The complexity class $\mathsf{PostBQP}$ corresponding to bounded-error quantum polynomial-time computations with postselection is known equivalent to PP [1]. A key technique in Ref. [19] was a $\mathrm{DQC1}_m$-type computation with postselection that simulates any given quantum circuit: By using a generalized Toffoli gate and the postselection over a single clean qubit, one can retrieve from the completely mixed state the ideal state in which all the qubits are in state $|0\rangle$. Hence, the output of any quantum circuit with postselection can be simulated by the $\mathrm{DQC1}_3$-type computation by measuring three qubits in total: one qubit is measured for the postselection to pick up the ideal all-zero state, another qubit is measured for the postselection of the quantum circuit to be simulated, and yet another qubit is measured to read out the output of the simulated circuit. This means that the $\mathrm{DQC1}_3$ model with postselection also has the computational power equivalent to $\mathsf{PostBQP} = \mathsf{PP}$. By an argument similar to that in Ref. [7], it follows that PP is in $\mathsf{PostBPP}$ (the version of BPP with postselection), if the $\mathrm{DQC1}_3$ model is weakly simulatable. Together with Toda's theorem [28], this implies the collapse of the polynomial-time hierarchy to the third level.

Main results. One obvious drawback of the existing argument above is an inevitable postselection measurement inherent to the definition of $\mathsf{PostBQP}$. This becomes a quite essential obstacle when trying to extend this argument to the DQC1 model, where only one qubit is allowed to be measured. To deal with the DQC1 model, this paper takes a different approach by considering the complexity class NQP introduced in Ref. [3] (or SBQP introduced in Ref. [18]).

Let $\mathsf{NQ}_{[1]}\mathsf{P}$ and $\mathsf{SBQ}_{[1]}\mathsf{P}$ be the versions of NQP and SBQP, respectively, in which quantum computation performed must be of DQC1 type. First, it is proved that the classes NQP and SBQP remain unchanged with this restriction.

Theorem 1. $\mathsf{NQP} = \mathsf{NQ}_{[1]}\mathsf{P}$ *and* $\mathsf{SBQP} = \mathsf{SBQ}_{[1]}\mathsf{P}$.

The proof devises a way of simulating a given quantum circuit Q acting over n qubits in the DQC1 model with $n+1$ qubits. More concretely, this paper presents a way of letting the single clean qubit of the DQC1 model play two roles simultaneously: Now the clean qubit not only serves as the flag qubit that indicates whether the remaining n qubits form $|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$, but also serves as the output qubit of the simulation of Q. The simulation of Q proceeds as follows:

1. Start from the initial state $|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \left(\frac{I}{2}\right)^{\otimes n}$, and flip the first qubit (the clean qubit) if the last n qubits (the completely mixed states) are in state $|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$.

2. Conditioned on the first qubit being $|1\rangle$, apply the quantum circuit Q to the last n qubits.

3. If the state after the simulation corresponds to the accepting state in the simulated computation, flip the phase of the first qubit.

4. Perform the inverse of the unitary operation of Step 2, and further perform the inverse of Step 1.

5. Measure the first qubit in the computational basis, and accept iff this results in 1.

The point is that, when Q realizes an NQP-type computation, this DQC1-type computation is still a computation of NQP-type: the acceptance probability of this DQC1-type computation is nonzero if and only if the input is a yes-instance. The SBQP case is proved similarly.

The main consequence of Theorem 1 is the following, which answers the question posed by Knill and Laflamme under a very plausible complexity assumption.

Theorem 2. *The DQC1 model is not weakly simulatable, unless* $\mathsf{PH} = \mathsf{AM}$.

Towards the contraposition of the statement, suppose that the DQC1 model were weakly simulatable. This would in particular imply that the above NQP-type computation in the DQC1 model is weakly simulatable. Hence, the weak-simulatability assumption would result in a classical computation whose acceptance probability is nonzero if and only if the input is a yes-instance, which implies the inclusion $\mathsf{NQP} \subseteq \mathsf{NP}$. Since $\mathsf{NQP} = \mathsf{co\text{-}C_{=}P}$ [12], this inclusion is sufficient to show the collapse of the polynomial-time hierarchy to AM (and thus, to the second level), by combining known properties in classical complexity theory. The same consequence can be derived by using SBQP instead of NQP: now the inclusion $\mathsf{SBQP} \subseteq \mathsf{SBP}$ follows from the weak-simulatability assumption, for the class SBP introduced in Ref. [6], and the fact $\mathsf{SBP} \subseteq \mathsf{AM}$ therein is used.

Further results. The above argument based on NQP (or SBQP) can replace the existing argument based on PostBQP, which was developed in Ref. [7], and has appeared frequently in the literature [2, 8, 16, 19, 24, 25]. In particular, it can be used even when discussing the unsimulatability of other sub-universal computing models such as the IQP model and the Boson sampling. This also weakens the complexity assumption necessary to prove the classical unsimulatability of each of such models (the collapse of the polynomial-time hierarchy is to the third level when using PostBQP, which is now to the second level using NQP or SBQP).

Finally, this paper also investigates the classical simulatability of the DQC1 and DQC1$_m$ models when additional restrictions are imposed, as has been done for other sub-universal quantum models [7, 8, 20, 24]. First, recall that any constant-depth quantum circuit with a single output qubit is *strongly simulatable* [13], that is, its output probability distribution is computable classically in polynomial time. This in particular implies that, if the circuit used in the DQC1 model is restricted to a constant-depth one, such a computation is strongly simulatable. This paper extends this fact to the DQC1$_m$ model: it is strongly simulatable if the circuit used in the DQC1$_m$ model is of constant depth. In the case where the circuit used is of depth logarithmic, the DQC1$_m$ model is shown *not* to be weakly simulatable unless the polynomial-time hierarchy collapses to the second level. This shows a clear distinction on the (weak) simulatability between logarithmic-depth and constant-depth circuits in the DQC1$_m$ model. Finally, it is proved that the IQP DQC1$_m$ model is strongly simulatable for every polynomially-bounded function m, where the IQP DQC1$_m$ model is a restricted DQC1$_m$ model such that quantum circuits used must consist of only IQP-type gates. As was shown in Ref. [7], IQP circuits with polynomially many output qubits are not even weakly simulatable unless the polynomial-time hierarchy collapses. Hence, our result suggests that the simulatability of IQP circuits changes drastically, if the clean initial state $|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$ is replaced by the one-clean-qubit initial state $|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \left(\frac{I}{2}\right)^{\otimes(n-1)}$.

2 Preliminaries

Circuits and gate sets. A family $\{C_w\}_{w\in\{0,1\}^*}$ of randomized or quantum circuits is called *polynomial-time uniformly generated* if there is a deterministic algorithm that given input w, outputs a classical description of C_w in time polynomial in $|w|$ (and thus, the size of C_w is also polynomially bounded in $|w|$).

For quantum circuits, this paper considers only unitary quantum circuits implemented with the gate set consisting of the Hadamard gate (the H gate), the CNOT gate, and the gate corresponding to the unitary operator $T = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\pi/4} \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Note that all the other gates used in this paper, such as the NOT gate (the X gate), the Toffoli gate, the Z gates, and the controlled-Z gate, are implemented exactly in this gate set without any ancilla qubits. The only exception is the generalized Toffoli gate (i.e., the k-controlled-NOT gate $\wedge_k(X)$), which is also exactly implementable with this gate set, but using some ancilla qubits, according to the constructions in Ref. [5]. In the construction in Lemma 7.2 of Ref. [5], the number of necessary ancilla qubits grows linearly with respect to the number of control qubits, and the construction in Corollary 7.4 of Ref. [5] uses only two ancilla qubits when $k \geq 5$, but an important property is that no initializations are required for all these ancilla qubits (and thus, all of them can actually be re-used when applying other generalized Toffoli gates). In particular, even completely mixed states may be used for these ancilla qubits, and hence, generalized Toffoli gates may be assumed available freely in the DQC1 model with the above-mentioned gate set. See Lemma 7.2 and Corollary 7.4 in Ref. [5] for details. For simplicity, in what follows, we identify the quantum circuit Q with the unitary operator it induces.

DQC1 model. A quantum computation of DQC1 type is a computation performed by a unitary quantum circuit Q. It is assumed that one of the qubits to which the circuit Q is applied is designated as the output qubit. The DQC1-type computation specified by the circuit Q proceeds as follows. Let n denote the number of qubits Q acts over. The initial state of the computation is the n-qubit state $\rho_{\text{init}} = |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes (I/2)^{\otimes(n-1)}$. The circuit Q is then applied to this initial state, which generates the n-qubit state $\rho_{\text{final}} = Q\rho_{\text{init}}Q^\dagger$. Now the designated output qubit is measured in the computational basis, where the outcome 1 is interpreted as "accept" and the outcome 0 is interpreted as "reject". A quantum computation of DQC1$_m$ type is defined similarly to the DQC1 case, except that m qubits are designated as the output qubits to be measured.

Classical simulatability. Following conventions, this paper uses the following definitions of simulatability. Consider any family $\{Q_w\}_{w\in\{0,1\}^*}$ of quantum circuits, and for each circuit Q_w, suppose that m output qubits are measured in the computational basis after the application of Q_w to a certain prescribed initial state (which will be clear from the context). Let $P_w\colon \{0,1\}^m \to [0,1]$ be the probability distribution derived from the output of Q_w (i.e., $P_w(x_1,\ldots,x_m)$ is the probability of obtaining the measurement result $(x_1,\ldots,x_m)$ in $\{0,1\}^m$ when Q_w is applied to the prescribed initial state).

The family $\{Q_w\}_{w\in\{0,1\}^*}$ is *weakly simulatable with multiplicative error* $c \geq 1$ if there exists a family $\{P'_w\}$ of probability distributions that can be sampled classically in polynomial time such that, for any w in $\{0,1\}^*$ and $(x_1,\ldots,x_m)$ in $\{0,1\}^m$,

$$\frac{1}{c}P_w(x_1,\ldots,x_m) \leq P'_w(x_1,\ldots,x_m) \leq cP_w(x_1,\ldots,x_m). \tag{1}$$

The family $\{Q_w\}_{w\in\{0,1\}^*}$ is *weakly simulatable with exponentially small additive error* if, for any polynomially bounded function q, there exists a family $\{P'_w\}$ of probability distributions that can be sampled classically in polynomial time such that, for any w in $\{0,1\}^*$ and $(x_1,\ldots,x_m)$ in $\{0,1\}^m$,

$$|P_w(x_1,\ldots,x_m) - P'_w(x_1,\ldots,x_m)| \leq 2^{-q(|w|)}.$$

Remark. The notion of weak simulatablity with multiplicative error was first defined in Ref. [27] in a slightly different form. The definition taken in this paper is found in Refs. [7, 19], for instance. The version in Ref. [27]

uses $|P_w(x_1,\ldots,x_m) - P'_w(x_1,\ldots,x_m)| \leq \varepsilon P_w(x_1,\ldots,x_m)$ instead of the bounds (1), and these two versions are essentially equivalent. The results in this paper hold for any ε in $[0,1)$ when using the version of Ref. [27]. The notion of weak simulatability with exponentially small additive error was introduced in Ref. [25], and was used also in Ref. [24].

Remark. As many existing studies adopt the weak simulatablity with multiplicative error when discussing the classical simulatability of quantum models (Refs. [27, 7, 2, 20, 8, 16, 19], for instance), it would be sufficiently reasonable to use this notion also in the case of the DQC1 model, which in particular makes it possible to discuss the power of the DQC1 model along the line of these existing studies. On the contrary, as discussed in Refs. [2, 7], the notion of weak simulatability with *polynomially* small additive error is perhaps much more desirable for experimentally verifying the superiority of a quantum computation model. Proving or disproving classical simulatability under this notion is one of the most important open problems in most of sub-universal quantum models including the DQC1 model.

Complexity classes. For a quantum circuit Q, let $p_{\rm acc}(Q)$ (resp., $p^{\rm DQC1}_{\rm acc}(Q)$) denote the acceptance probability of Q (resp., the acceptance probability of Q in the DQC1 model), i.e., the probability that the measurement on the designated output qubit of Q in the computational basis results in 1 after Q is performed with the initial state $|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$ (resp., $|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \left(\frac{I}{2}\right)^{\otimes(n-1)}$), where n is the number of qubits Q acts over. For a randomized circuit C, its acceptance probability $p_{\rm acc}(C)$ is defined as the probability that the designated output bit of C is 1 after C is performed with input 0^n, where n is the number of bits C acts over.

A language L is in NQP iff there exists a polynomial-time uniformly generated family $\{C_w\}_{w\in\{0,1\}^*}$ of quantum circuits such that for every $w \in \{0,1\}^*$, (i) if w is in L, $p_{\rm acc}(C_w) > 0$, and (ii) if w is not in L, $p_{\rm acc}(C_w) = 0$.

A language L is in SBP (resp., SBQP) iff there exist a polynomially bounded function q and a polynomial-time uniformly generated family $\{C_w\}_{w\in\{0,1\}^*}$ of randomized (resp., quantum) circuits such that, for every $w \in \{0,1\}^*$, (i) if w is in L, $p_{\rm acc}(C_w) \geq 2^{-q(|w|)}$, and (ii) if w is not in L, $p_{\rm acc}(C_w) \leq 2^{-q(|w|)-1}$.

Note that the classes SBP and SBQP remain unchanged even when the two thresholds $2^{-q(|w|)}$ and $2^{-q(|w|)-1}$ are replaced by $c2^{-q(|w|)}$ and $c'2^{-q(|w|)}$, respectively, for any two constants c and c' satisfying $0 < c' < c \leq 1$.

The complexity classes $\mathsf{NQ}_{[1]}\mathsf{P}$ and $\mathsf{SBQ}_{[1]}\mathsf{P}$ are defined by replacing every $p_{\rm acc}(C_w)$ with $p^{\rm DQC1}_{\rm acc}(C_w)$ in the definitions of NQP and SBQP, respectively.

3 Main Results

To prove Theorem 1, we start with analyzing the DQC1-type computation presented in Section 1.

Consider any polynomial-time uniformly generated family $\{Q_w\}_{w\in\{0,1\}^*}$ of quantum circuits. Fix w in $\{0,1\}^*$, and let n be the number of qubits Q_w acts over. Without loss of generality, it is assumed that the first qubit is the designated output qubit of Q_w. Let p_w be the probability $p_{\rm acc}(Q_w)$ of obtaining the classical outcome 1 when measuring the output qubit of Q_w in the computational basis, i.e.,

$$p_w = \|\Pi_1 Q_w |0\rangle^{\otimes n}\|^2,$$

where Π_1 is the projection $|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes I^{\otimes(n-1)}$.

Consider the quantum circuit D_w depicted in Fig. 1, which acts over $n+1$ qubits. As indicated in Fig. 1, the first qubit is the output qubit of D_w. We analyze the DQC1-type computation induced by D_w.

Lemma 3. *Let $\tilde{p}_w$ be the probability that the measurement on the output qubit of D_w in the computational basis results in 1 after D_w is performed with the initial state $|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \left(\frac{I}{2}\right)^{\otimes n}$. Then, $\tilde{p}_w = \frac{4}{2^n} p_w(1-p_w)$.*

Proof. First, consider the case where the first generalized Toffoli gate is activated, meaning that the content of the first qubit is flipped from 0 to 1 and all the n input qubits of Q_w are set to the state $|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$. This occurs with



Figure 1: Circuit D_w. Note that the first and the last layers are generalized Toffoli gates, where black circles are control parts and $\oplus$ is the target part, and the gate represented by two black circles connected by a vertical line is a controlled-Z gate.

probability $\frac{1}{2^n}$. In this case, the controlled-Z gate flips the phase if and only if the content of the output qubit of Q_w is 1, that is, this gate performs the operation $I^{\otimes n} - 2\Pi_1$ over the last n qubits. Hence, the state of the last n qubits immediately after applying $Q_w^\dagger$ is given by $Q_w^\dagger\big(I^{\otimes n} - 2\Pi_1\big)Q_w|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$, and thus, the last generalized Toffoli gate is activated with probability

$$\big|\langle 0|^{\otimes n} Q_w^\dagger \big(I^{\otimes n} - 2\Pi_1\big) Q_w |0\rangle^{\otimes n}\big|^2 = \big|1 - 2\|\Pi_1 Q_w |0\rangle^{\otimes n}\|^2\big| = (1-2p_w)^2.$$

The probability that the last generalized Toffoli gate is *not* activated is hence $1-(1-2p_w)^2 = 4p_w(1-p_w)$. With this probability, the outcome of D_w is 1 (on the condition that the first generalized Toffoli is activated).

Now consider the case where the first generalized Toffoli gate is *not* activated. In this case, the first qubit is still $|0\rangle$ after applying the generalized Toffoli gate. Thus, the controlled-Z gate is not activated, implying that Q_w and $Q_w^\dagger$ are cancelled. Therefore, the last generalized Toffoli gate is not activated, either, and the outcome of D_w is always 0.

The total probability of obtaining the outcome 1 is thus $\frac{4}{2^n}p_w(1-p_w)$. □

From Lemma 3, Theorem 1 is easily proved as follows.

Proof of Theorem 1. Suppose that a language L is in NQP, and let $\{Q_w\}$ be a polynomial-time uniformly generated family of quantum circuits that witnesses this fact. By the definition of NQP, for every $w \in \{0,1\}^*$, the acceptance probability p_w of the circuit Q_w is positive if and only if w is in L. Without loss of generality, one can assume that $p_w < 1$ for every w.

From each Q_w, we construct a quantum circuit D_w as defined in Fig. 1, which provides the polynomial-time uniformly generated family $\{D_w\}$ of quantum circuits. From Lemma 3, this $\{D_w\}$ ensures that L is in $\mathsf{NQ}_{[1]}\mathsf{P}$, as the probability $\tilde{p}_w$ associated with D_w is nonzero if and only if $0 < p_w < 1$. The other containment $\mathsf{NQ}_{[1]}\mathsf{P} \subseteq \mathsf{NQP}$ is trivial. That $\mathsf{SBQP} = \mathsf{SBQ}_{[1]}\mathsf{P}$ can be proved similarly[1]. □

Next, we give a formal statement of Theorem 2.

Theorem 4. *If any polynomial-time uniformly generated family of quantum circuits, when used in the DQC1-type computations, is weakly simulatable with multiplicative error $c \geq 1$ or exponentially small additive error,* $\mathsf{PH} = \mathsf{AM}$.

[1]Notice that without loss of generality we can assume that n depends on $|w|$ only, and thus the proof can be done based on the definition of SBQP, instead of NQP.

Theorem 4 follows directly from Lemmas 5, 6, and 7 below.

Lemma 5. *If any polynomial-time uniformly generated family of quantum circuits, when used in the DQC1-type computations, is weakly simulatable with multiplicative error $c \geq 1$ (resp., exponentially small additive error), then* $\mathsf{NQP} = \mathsf{NP}$ *(resp.,* $\mathsf{NQP} \subseteq \mathsf{SBP}$*).*

Proof. Fix any language L in NQP. By Theorem 1, there is a polynomial-time uniformly generated family $\{D_w\}$ of quantum circuits such that, for every $w \in \{0,1\}^*$, the acceptance probability $\tilde{p}_w$ in the DQC1-type computation induced by D_w is nonzero if and only if w is in L. From the assumption of this lemma, there exists a polynomial-time uniformly generated family $\{C_w\}$ of randomized circuits such that weakly simulates $\{D_w\}$ with multiplicative error $c \geq 1$. By the definition, the probability that the circuit C_w outputs 1 is nonzero if and only if $\tilde{p}_w$ is nonzero, which happens only when w is in L. This implies that L is in NP.

In the case where $\{C_w\}$ weakly simulates $\{D_w\}$ with exponentially small additive error, we use the fact that $\tilde{p}_w$ with each w in L may be assumed to be bounded from below by $2^{-q(|w|)}$ for a certain polynomially bounded function q. This implies that the probability that C_w outputs 1 when w is in L must differ from the probability when w is not in L by at least a constant multiplicative factor, if we set a sufficiently small additive error, say, $2^{-q(|w|)}/1000$, which shows that L is in SBP. □

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be any class of languages. A language L is in $\mathsf{BP} \cdot \mathcal{C}$ if there exist a language $A \in \mathcal{C}$ and a polynomially bounded function r such that for every $w \in \{0,1\}^*$,

$$|\{z \in \{0,1\}^{r(|w|)} : w \in L \text{ iff } \langle w, z\rangle \in A\}| \geq \frac{2}{3} \cdot 2^{r(|w|)}.$$

It is easy to see that $\mathsf{AM} = \mathsf{BP} \cdot \mathsf{NP}$. In Ref. [29], the following variant of the BP operator was defined: L is in $\widehat{\mathsf{BP}} \cdot \mathcal{C}$ if for every polynomially bounded function q, there exist a language $A \in \mathcal{C}$ and a polynomially bounded function r such that for every $w \in \{0,1\}^*$,

$$|\{z \in \{0,1\}^{r(|w|)} : w \in L \text{ iff } \langle w, z\rangle \in A\}| \geq (1 - 2^{-q(|w|)})2^{r(|w|)}.$$

By the standard amplification of AM, one can see that $\mathsf{AM} = \mathsf{BP} \cdot \mathsf{NP} = \widehat{\mathsf{BP}} \cdot \mathsf{NP}$.

Lemma 6. *If* $\mathsf{NQP} = \mathsf{NP}$*, then* $\mathsf{PH} = \mathsf{AM}$.

Proof. This follows from the following sequence of containments:

$$\mathsf{PH} \subseteq \mathsf{BP} \cdot \mathsf{co\text{-}C_{=}P} = \mathsf{BP} \cdot \mathsf{NQP} = \mathsf{BP} \cdot \mathsf{NP} = \mathsf{AM},$$

where the first containment is by Corollary 2.5 in Ref. [29] or Corollary 5.2 in Ref. [26], and the next two equalities follow from the fact $\mathsf{NQP} = \mathsf{co\text{-}C_{=}P}$ [12] and the assumption $\mathsf{NQP} = \mathsf{NP}$ of this lemma, respectively. □

Lemma 7. *If* $\mathsf{NQP} \subseteq \mathsf{SBP}$*, then* $\mathsf{PH} = \mathsf{AM}$.

Proof. The claim follows from the following sequence of containments:

$$\mathsf{PH} \subseteq \widehat{\mathsf{BP}} \cdot \mathsf{co\text{-}C_{=}P} = \widehat{\mathsf{BP}} \cdot \mathsf{NQP} \subseteq \widehat{\mathsf{BP}} \cdot \mathsf{SBP} \subseteq \widehat{\mathsf{BP}} \cdot \widehat{\mathsf{BP}} \cdot \mathsf{NP} = \widehat{\mathsf{BP}} \cdot \mathsf{NP} = \mathsf{AM},$$

where the first inclusion is by Corollary 2.5 in Ref. [29], and we have used the fact $\mathsf{NQP} = \mathsf{co\text{-}C_{=}P}$ [12], the assumption $\mathsf{NQP} \subseteq \mathsf{SBP}$ of this lemma, and the facts $\mathsf{SBP} \subseteq \mathsf{AM}$ [6] and $\widehat{\mathsf{BP}} \cdot \mathsf{NP} = \mathsf{AM}$, as well as Lemma 2.8 in Ref. [29] on the removability of a duplicate $\widehat{\mathsf{BP}}$ operator. □

Remark. The collapse of PH to AM follows from the assumption $\mathsf{SBQP} = \mathsf{SBP}$, too, as $\mathsf{NQP} \subseteq \mathsf{SBQP}$ holds (note that the acceptance probability of NQP-type computation on any yes-instance is at least $1/2^q$ for some polynomial q).

The following theorem is obtained by Lemmas 6 and 7, and a slight modification of the proof of Lemma 5, in which Theorem 1 is replaced by the assumption of the theorem.

Theorem 8. *Assume that given a polynomial-time uniformly generated family $\{Q_w\}$ of quantum circuits, there is a polynomial-time uniformly generated family $\{D_w\}$ of quantum circuits conforming to a computing model $\mathcal{M}$ whose acceptance probability is positive (resp. at least $\frac{p_{\rm acc}(Q_w)}{2^{r(|w|)}}$ for some polynomial r) if $p_{\rm acc}(Q_w) > 0$, and zero if $p_{\rm acc}(Q_w) = 0$. If $\mathcal{M}$ is weakly simulatable with multiplicative error $c \geq 1$ (resp. exponentially small additive error), then* $\mathsf{PH} = \mathsf{AM}$.

Theorem 8 implies that the collapse of the polynomial-time hierarchy in the previous results on the IQP model [7], the Boson sampling model [2], etc. can be also improved from the third level to the second level. In fact, for all the previous results using the argument based on $\mathsf{PostBQP}$ [2, 7, 8, 16, 19, 24, 25], we can apply Theorem 8 to them, since the corresponding circuit D_w is a postselected circuit, and the outcome of D_w is considered to be accept if and only if the output qubit and the postselection qubit are both 1. Moreover, our argument clarifies that Theorem 8 holds for any multiplicative constant $c \geq 1$, while c is restricted to $1 \leq c < \sqrt{2}$ in Refs. [7, 19].

4 DQC1$_m$ model with additional restrictions

4.1 Depth-restricted quantum circuits

First, we consider the case where the depth of quantum circuits, when used in the DQC1$_m$-type computations, is logarithmic in the length of the input. For the case where the number of output qubits is not restricted, it is shown that the classical simulation is hard unless the polynomial-time hierarchy collapses (note that for $m = 1$, i.e., the DQC1 type, we do not know whether a similar result holds).

Theorem 9. *If any polynomial-time uniformly generated family of logarithmic-depth quantum circuits, when used in the DQC1$_m$-type computations, is weakly simulatable with multiplicative error $c \geq 1$ (or exponentially small additive error) for sufficiently large m, then* $\mathsf{PH} = \mathsf{AM}$.

Proof. We only give the proof for the case of multiplicative error as its modification to the case of exponentially small additive error is similar to the proof of Theorem 4.

Let us assume that a language L is in NQP. This means that there exists a polynomial-time uniformly generated family $\{Q_w\}$ of quantum circuits such that the output probability distribution P_{Q_w} satisfies: if $w \in L$ then $P_{Q_w}(o = 1) > 0$, and if $w \notin L$ then $P_{Q_w}(o = 1) = 0$, where o is the single-bit output of the quantum circuit Q_w. By using the gate teleportation technique [13, Lemma 1], we can construct from Q_w a constant-depth quantum circuit Q'_w which has $(r + 1)$ output qubits $(o, p_1, \ldots, p_r)$, where r is polynomially bounded in $|w|$, such that its output probability distribution $P_{Q'_w}$ satisfies

$$P_{Q'_w}(o = 1 | p_1 = \cdots = p_r = 1) = P_{Q_w}(o = 1).$$

From Q'_w, we further construct a logarithmic-depth quantum circuit V_w as follows:

1. Prepare the qubits used to simulate Q'_w and an extra qubit (called qubit o') to $|0\rangle$.
2. Apply Q'_w on the qubits except o'.
3. Prepare more extra qubits to $|0\rangle$ for using Toffoli gates as (binary) AND gates, and take the r-ary AND of all the qubits $(p_1, \ldots, p_r)$ (let p' be one of the extra qubits used for the result of the r-ary AND).
4. Set $o' = 0$ if and only if $o = 1$ and $p' = 1$.

As step 3 is implemented in $O(\log|w|)$ depth, it can be seen that the depth of V_w is at most logarithmic in $|w|$. Also, it is easy to verify that the output distribution P_{V_w} satisfies

$$P_{V_w}(o'=0)=\frac{P_{Q_w}(o=1)}{2^r}.$$

Let us assume that any logarithmic depth quantum circuit, when used in the DQC1$_m$-type computations, can be classically efficiently sampled with multiplicative error $c\geq 1$. Assume that V_w acts on $l+1$ qubits, where l is polynomially bounded in $|w|$. Now consider the DQC1$_{l+1}$-type computation specified by the circuit $V_w^\dagger$. Let P'_w be the output probability distribution of the classical simulator of this computation, which has $l+1$ output ports $(o_1,\ldots,o_{l+1})$.

Then, if $w\in L$,

$$\begin{aligned}
P'_w(o_1=\cdots=o_{l+1}=0) &\geq \frac{1}{c}\mathrm{Tr}\Big[(|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes(l+1)}\times V_w^\dagger\Big(|0\rangle\langle 0|\otimes\frac{I^{\otimes l}}{2^l}\Big)V_w\Big]\\
&= \frac{1}{c2^l}\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\Big(|0\rangle\langle 0|\otimes I^{\otimes l}\Big)\times V_w(|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes(l+1)}V_w^\dagger\Big]\\
&= \frac{P_{Q_w}(o=1)}{c2^{l+r}}\\
&> 0.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $w\notin L$,

$$\begin{aligned}
P'_w(o_1=\cdots=o_{l+1}=0) &\leq c\mathrm{Tr}\Big[(|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes(l+1)}\times V_w^\dagger\Big(|0\rangle\langle 0|\otimes\frac{I^{\otimes l}}{2^l}\Big)V_w\Big]\\
&= \frac{c}{2^l}\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\Big(|0\rangle\langle 0|\otimes I^{\otimes l}\Big)\times V_w(|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes(l+1)}V_w^\dagger\Big]\\
&= \frac{cP_{Q_w}(o=1)}{2^{l+r}}\\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This means that L is in NP. Therefore, NQP $\subseteq$ NP, which leads to PH $=$ AM. □

On the contrary, if we further restrict the depth to a constant, then the DQC1$_m$ model is classically simulatable in the strong sense. This contrasts with the fact that the IQP model is hard to simulate classically even if the depth is restricted to a constant [7] unless the polynomial-time hierarchy collapses.

Theorem 10. *Any polynomial-time uniformly generated family of constant-depth (or even doubly logarithmic depth) quantum circuits, when used in the DQC1$_m$-type computations, is strongly simulatable for every m. In other words, any marginal distribution of the output of the circuit can be calculated with a classical polynomial-time computer.*

Proof. Let Q be an $(l+1)$-qubit constant-depth quantum circuit, when used in the DQC1$_{l+1}$-type computations, where l is a polynomial in the input length (here we omit the subscript of the circuit name which represents the input). For any $z=(z_1,\ldots,z_{l+1})\in\{0,1\}^{l+1}$, let $P(z)$ be the probability that the output of Q is z. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
P(z) &= \mathrm{Tr}\Big[|z\rangle\langle z|\times Q\Big(|0\rangle\langle 0|\otimes\frac{I^{\otimes l}}{2^l}\Big)Q^\dagger\Big]\\
&= \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\Big(\bigotimes_{j=1}^{l+1}X^{z_j}\Big)(|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes(l+1)}\Big(\bigotimes_{j=1}^{l+1}X^{z_j}\Big)\times Q\Big(|0\rangle\langle 0|\otimes\frac{I^{\otimes l}}{2^l}\Big)Q^\dagger\Big]\\
&= \frac{1}{2^l}\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\Big(|0\rangle\langle 0|\otimes I^{\otimes l}\Big)\times Q^\dagger\Big(\bigotimes_{j=1}^{l+1}X^{z_j}\Big)(|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes(l+1)}\Big(\bigotimes_{j=1}^{l+1}X^{z_j}\Big)Q\Big],
\end{aligned}$$

which can be exactly calculated for any z, since the numerator is the single-qubit output probability of the constant-depth circuit $Q^\dagger \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^{l+1} X^{z_j}\right)$ with the input $|0\rangle^{\otimes(l+1)}$. (Note that the single-qubit output probability distribution of any constant-depth quantum circuit can be exactly calculated with a polynomial-time classical computer [13], since the single output qubit is entangled only a constant number of input qubits, and the quantum computing of a constant number of qubits can be easily simulated with a classical computer.)

Any marginal of the probability distribution $\{P(z)\}$ can also be exactly calculated, since in this case we have only to consider a constant-depth quantum circuit where some of clean input qubits are replaced with completely-mixed states.

Finally, it is easily seen that the above proof works even if the depth of Q is at most $d = \log_2(c \cdot \log_2 n)$ for the input length n and a positive constant c, since in this case the single output qubit is affected by at most $2^d = c \cdot \log_2 n$ input qubits, and thus we only need to consider a subspace of $2^{2^d} = n^c$ dimension. □

4.2 IQP DQC1$_m$ model

Finally, we consider the "intersection" of the IQP model and the DQC1 model. An IQP DQC1$_m$ circuit is defined in the following way: For any polynomially-bounded l and any $m \leq l+1$,

1. the input state is $|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes (\frac{I}{2})^{\otimes l}$;
2. apply $H^{\otimes(l+1)}$ to all the qubits;
3. apply a polynomial number of the controlled-Z gates and the $e^{i\theta Z}$ gates[2];
4. apply $H^{\otimes(l+1)}$ to all the qubits;
5. measure m output qubits in the computational basis.

Ref. [7] shows that IQP circuits with polynomially many output qubits are not even weakly simulatable unless the polynomial hierarchy collapses. Here, we can show that any IQP DQC1$_m$ circuit is strongly simulatable for any m.

Theorem 11. *Any polynomial-time uniformly generated family of IQP DQC1$_m$ circuits is strongly simulatable for every m.*

Proof. Let Q be an $(l+1)$-qubit IQP DQC1$_{l+1}$ circuit. Since the controlled-Z gate and the $e^{i\theta Z}$ gate commute with each other, we can write Q as

$$Q = H^{\otimes(l+1)} \Big(\bigotimes_{j=1}^{l+1} e^{i\theta_j Z} \Big) \Big(\prod_{(i,j)\in E} CZ_{i,j} \Big) H^{\otimes(l+1)}$$

without loss of generality, where E is the set of edges of a certain $(l+1)$-vertex graph G, and $CZ_{i,j}$ denotes the operator on the $(l+1)$ qubits that corresponds to the controlled-Z gate applied to the two qubits on vertices i and j. Furthermore, it is easy to verify that Q commutes with $\bigotimes_{j=1}^{l+1} X^{x_j}$ for any $(x_1, \ldots, x_{l+1}) \in \{0,1\}^{l+1}$.

[2]Here, θ is a multiple of $\pi/8$ due to our choice of the gate sets. However, Theorem 11 holds when θ is any polynomial-time computable real, if arbitrarily small approximation error is allowed for the strong simulation. Moreover, it still holds even if the controlled-Z gates are extended to the $e^{i\theta(Z_{j_1} \otimes Z_{j_2})}$ gates (where Z_j denotes the Z gate acting on qubit j).

For any $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_{l+1}) \in \{0,1\}^{l+1}$, let $P(z)$ be the probability that the output of Q is z. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
P(z) &= \mathrm{Tr}\Big[|z\rangle\langle z| \times Q\Big(|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \frac{I^{\otimes l}}{2^l}\Big)Q^\dagger\Big] \\
&= \frac{1}{2^l}\sum_{s\in\{0,1\}^l} \mathrm{Tr}\Big[|z\rangle\langle z| \times Q\Big(I \otimes \bigotimes_{j=1}^{l} X^{s_j}\Big)\Big(|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes l}\Big)\Big(I \otimes \bigotimes_{j=1}^{l} X^{s_j}\Big)Q^\dagger\Big] \\
&= \frac{1}{2^l}\sum_{s\in\{0,1\}^l} \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\Big(I \otimes \bigotimes_{j=1}^{l} X^{s_j}\Big)|z\rangle\langle z|\Big(I \otimes \bigotimes_{j=1}^{l} X^{s_j}\Big) \times Q\Big((|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes(l+1)}\Big)Q^\dagger\Big] \\
&= \frac{1}{2^l}\sum_{s\in\{0,1\}^l} \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\Big(|z_1\rangle\langle z_1| \otimes \bigotimes_{j=1}^{l} |z_{j+1}\oplus s_j\rangle\langle z_{j+1}\oplus s_j|\Big) \times Q\Big((|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes(l+1)}\Big)Q^\dagger\Big] \\
&= \frac{1}{2^l}\mathrm{Tr}\Big[(|z_1\rangle\langle z_1| \otimes I^{\otimes l}) \times Q\Big((|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes(l+1)}\Big)Q^\dagger\Big] \\
&= \frac{1}{2^l}\mathrm{Tr}\Big[(|\phi_{z_1}\rangle\langle\phi_{z_1}| \otimes I^{\otimes l}) \times |G\rangle\langle G|\Big]
\end{aligned}$$

where s_j is the jth bit of s,

$$|G\rangle = \Big(\prod_{(i,j)\in E} CZ_{i,j}\Big)|+\rangle^{\otimes(l+1)}$$

is a graph state (recall that $|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$), and

$$|\phi_{z_1}\rangle = e^{-i\theta_1 Z}H|z_1\rangle.$$

Note that $p(z_1) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}\Big[(|\phi_{z_1}\rangle\langle\phi_{z_1}| \otimes I^{\otimes m}) \times |G\rangle\langle G|\Big]$ determines the output probability distribution of the single-qubit measurement on the graph state. This can be calculated in classical polynomial time: If the vertex of G corresponding to the first qubit is isolated, $p(z_1)$ can be easily calculated since a single qubit quantum computing can be trivially simulated with a classical computer. If the vertex is not isolated, $p(z_1) = \frac{1}{2}$, since

$$|G\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big[|0\rangle \otimes |G'\rangle + |1\rangle \otimes \Big(\bigotimes_{(1,j)\in E} Z_j\Big)|G'\rangle\Big],$$

where Z_j is the Z gate applied to the qubit on vertex j, G' is the m-vertex graph created from G by removing the first vertex and edges connected with the first vertex, and $|G'\rangle$ and $\Big(\bigotimes_{(1,j)\in E} Z_j\Big)|G'\rangle$ are orthogonal with each other. Thus, $P(z)$ is calculated in classical polynomial time. □

Acknowledgements

Keisuke Fujii is supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Research Activity Start-up 25887034. Hirotada Kobayashi and Harumichi Nishimura are supported by KAKENHI 24240001. Tomoyuki Morimae is supported by the Tenure Track System by MEXT Japan, and KAKENHI 26730003. Harumichi Nishimura is also supported by KAKENHI 24106009 and 25330012. Hirotada Kobayashi and Seiichiro Tani are also grateful to KAKENHI 24106009.

References

[1] Aaronson, S.: Quantum computing, postselection, and probabilistic polynomial-time. Proc. R. Soc. A 461(2063), 3473–3482 (2005)

[2] Aaronson, S., Arkhipov, A.: The computational complexity of linear optics. Theory Comput. 9, 143–252 (article 4) (2013)

[3] Adleman, L.M., DeMarrais, J., Huang, M.D.A.: Quantum computability. SIAM J. Comput. 26(5), 1524–1540 (1997)

[4] Ambainis, A., Schulman, L.J., Vazirani, U.: Computing with highly mixed states. J. ACM 53(3), 507–531 (2006)

[5] Barenco, A., Bennett, C.H., Cleve, R., DiVincenzo, D.P., Margolus, N., Shor, P., Sleator, T., Smolin, J.A., Weinfurter, H.: Elementary gates for quantum computation. Phys. Rev. A 52(5), 3457–3467 (1995)

[6] Böhler, E., Glaßer, C., Meister, D.: Error-bounded probabilistic computations between MA and AM. J. Comput. Syst. Sci. 72(6), 1043–1076 (2006)

[7] Bremner, M.J., Jozsa, R., Shepherd, D.J.: Classical simulation of commuting quantum computations implies collapse of the polynomial hierarchy. Proc. R. Soc. A 467(2126), 459–472 (2011)

[8] Brod, D.J.: The complexity of simulating constant-depth BosonSampling (2014), arXiv.org e-Print archive, arXiv:1412.6788 [quant-ph]

[9] Datta, A., Flammia, S.T., Caves, C.M.: Entanglement and the power of one qubit. Phys. Rev. A 72(4), article 042316 (2005)

[10] Datta, A., Shaji, A., Caves, C.M.: Quantum discord and the power of one qubit. Phys. Rev. Lett. 100(5), article 050502 (2008)

[11] Datta, A., Vidal, G.: Role of entanglement and correlations in mixed-state quantum computation. Phys. Rev. A 75(4), article 042310 (2007)

[12] Fenner, S., Green, F., Homer, S., Pruim, R.: Determining acceptance possibility for a quantum computation is hard for the polynomial hierarchy. Proc. R. Soc. A 455(1991), 3953–3966 (1999)

[13] Fenner, S., Green, F., Homer, S., Zhang, Y.: Bounds on the power of constant-depth quantum circuits. In: Fundamentals of Computation Theory, 15th International Symposium, FCT 2005. Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 362 (2005)

[14] Jordan, S.P., Alagic, G.: Approximating the Turaev-Viro invariant of mapping tori is complete for one clean qubit. In: Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication, and Cryptography, 6th Conference, TQC 2011, Revised Sele (2014)

[15] Jordan, S.P., Wocjan, P.: Estimating Jones and HOMFLY polynomials with one clean qubit. Quantum Inf. Comput. 9(3–4), 0264–0289 (2009)

[16] Jozsa, R., Van den Nest, M.: Classical simulation complexity of extended Clifford circuits. Quantum Inf. Comput. 14(7–8), 0633–0648 (2014)

[17] Knill, E., Laflamme, R.: Power of one bit of quantum information. Phys. Rev. Lett. 81(25), 5672–5675 (1998)

[18] Kuperberg, G.: How hard is it to approximate the Jones polynomial? (2009), arXiv.org e-print archive, arXiv:0908.0512 [quant-ph]

[19] Morimae, T., Fujii, K., Fitzsimons, J.F.: Hardness of classically simulating the one-clean-qubit model. Phys. Rev. Lett. 112(13), article 130502 (2014)

[20] Ni, X., Van den Nest, M.: Commuting quantum circuits: Efficient classical simulations versus hardness results. Quantum Inf. Comput. 13(1–2), 0054–0072 (2013)

[21] Poulin, D., Blume-Kohout, R., Laflamme, R., Ollivier, H.: Exponential speedup with a single bit of quantum information: Measuring the average fidelity decay. Phys. Rev. Lett. 92(17), article 177906 (2004)

[22] Poulin, D., Laflamme, R., Milburn, G.J., Paz, J.P.: Testing integrability with a single bit of quantum information. Phys. Rev. A 68(2), article 022302 (2003)

[23] Shor, P.W., Jordan, S.P.: Estimating Jones polynomials is a complete problem for one clean qubit. Quantum Inf. Comput. 8(8–9), 0681–0714 (2008)

[24] Takahashi, Y., Tani, S., Yamazaki, T., Tanaka, K.: Commuting quantum circuits with few outputs are unlikely to be classically simulatable (2014), arXiv.org e-Print archive, arXiv:1409.6792 [quant-ph]

[25] Takahashi, Y., Yamazaki, T., Tanaka, K.: Hardness of classically simulating quantum circuits with unbounded Toffoli and fan-out gates. Quantum Inf. Comput. 14(13–14), 1149–1164 (2014)

[26] Tarui, J.: Probabilistic polynomials, AC^0 functions and the polynomial-time hierarchy. Theor. Comput. Sci. 113(1), 167–183 (1993)

[27] Terhal, B.M., DiVincenzo, D.P.: Adptive quantum computation, constant depth quantum circuits and Arthur-Merlin games. Quantum Inf. Comput. 4(2), 134–145 (2004)

[28] Toda, S.: PP is as hard as the polynomial-time hierarchy. SIAM J. Comput. 20(5), 865–877 (1991)

[29] Toda, S., Ogiwara, M.: Counting classes are at least as hard as the polynomial-time hierarchy. SIAM J. Comput. 21(2), 316–328 (1992)